The Optics of Ps-Grosseteste: Editing Peter of Limoges's *Tractatus moralis de oculo*

Richard Newhauser

When preachers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries wanted to expand a sermon by drawing moral lessons from the physiology of eyesight, or by quoting a biblical passage on vision that might serve as the basis for a lesson on how to see spiritually, they often made use of a preaching aid beginning 'Si diligenter uoluerimus in lege Domini meditari'. Above all, they turned to this treatise for *exempla* illustrating the principles of optics, or just as frequently those giving a narrative form to more general moral edification (or for passages of verse functioning in the same way from authors as diverse as Juvenal, Horace, Johannes de Hauvilla, or anonymous Medieval Latin *sententiae*). This Latin text, the *Tractatus moralis de oculo*,[1] was composed in Paris in the late thirteenth century by a French author, Peter of Limoges, and it was transmitted in almost every country in Europe. It may, thus, be excusable to begin an essay examining the textual basis for an edition of the *Tractatus* by justifying its place in a volume devoted to editing texts from medieval Britain.

[1] For the most recent list of manuscript witnesses to the wide transmission of the text, see Richard Newhauser and István Bejczy, *A Supplement to Morton W. Bloomfield et al., 'Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices, 1100–1500 A.D.'*, Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia, Research on the Inheritance of Early and Medieval Christianity, 50 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), no. 5532.

Richard Newhauser is Professor of English and Medieval Studies at Arizona State University, Tempe. He has recently finished a translation of Peter of Limoges's *Tractatus moralis de oculo* and is currently working to complete the first critical edition of the Latin text.

Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century, ed. by Vincent Gillespie and Anne Hudson, TT 5 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 167–194 BREPOLS PUBLISHERS
10.1484/M.TT-EB.1.101739

The grounds for including such an essay in a British context are essentially pedagogical: Peter of Limoges was among the most influential authors in the development of later medieval homiletic literature in the British Isles whose name remained wholly unknown in Britain throughout the Middle Ages. The far-reaching importance of Peter's *Tractatus* for the English pulpit has not received adequate assessment partially because of the lack of a modern, critical edition. This essay hopes to help lay the foundations for the modern edition of Peter's work and at the same time function as a prolegomenon to making the *Tractatus* better known to a scholarly audience.

The medieval transmission of Peter's work in the British Isles has contributed to a lack of recognition of its true authorship there. Many of the extant or attested copies of the treatise of British provenance come with no authorial attribution. In an early codex from England one does find an attribution to an author '<... d>e lymochia', but that notation is in a fifteenth-century hand.[2] Two other fifteenth-century English copies of the text also attribute the work to 'magister de Limochia' (or 'Lunochia').[3] It is, however, unclear what location Lymochia was thought to designate. Only one manuscript now in England carries an attribution to Peter of Limoges ('magister Petrus de Cyperia Lemouicensis dyocesis'), but this is a fifteenth-century codex from Germany.[4] On the other hand, Robert Grosseteste's well-documented interest in both the science of vision and *pastoralia* made him a likely candidate for the authorship of a work on moralized optics, especially in the British Isles. Moreover, a composition on the eye made a fitting companion to the treatise *De lingua* that was also attributed to the Bishop of Lincoln in the Middle Ages and occasionally circulated with the *Tractatus moralis de oculo*.[5] This attribution of the *Tractatus*

[2] Durham, Durham University Library, MS Mickleton & Spearman 89 (end of the thirteenth century), fol. 1^{r} (folio torn) (MS D5). It was in the library of the Benedictine cathedral priory of St Cuthbert in Durham in the late fifteenth to early sixteenth century (it is signed by Henry Thew, monk in Durham from *c.* 1483 into the 1530s, on fol. iv^{v}). See N. R. Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969–2002), II (1977), 517; N. R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books*, 2nd edn (London: Royal Historical Society, 1964), p. 72; A. I. Doyle and F. J. W. H[arding], 'Unrecorded Monastic Manuscript', *Durham Philobiblon*, 1 (1949–55), 44.

[3] Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 315 (*SC* 2712), fol. 28^{rb} (MS O3); and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 742 (*SC* 2756), with attribution by Thomas Barlow (Bodleian librarian in the seventeenth century) (MS O4).

[4] Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hamilton 21 (*SC* 24451), fols 174va–194^{vb}.

[5] On the *De lingua* see Edwin D. Craun, *Lies, Slander, and Obscenity in Medieval English Literature: Pastoral Rhetoric and the Deviant Speaker*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval

to Grosseteste is, in fact, found in twenty-nine extant manuscripts and ten attested copies of the text, the vast majority of them completed in England. In them, Grosseteste is named as the author of the *Tractatus* either in the hand of the scribe or in that of later readers and librarians. Other English names appear in manuscripts as the author of Peter's text, as well: John of Wales in a few copies and, especially in Germany, John Pecham, under whose name the *editio princeps* appeared. But Grosseteste was the author of choice for many medieval English scribes and librarians.

The earliest attributions to Grosseteste occur in a manuscript written in Britain in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century (Bryn Mawr, Bryn Mawr College Library, MS 18 (MS By)) and in a codex from the beginning of the fourteenth century, also probably of English provenance (London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 483 (MS L11)).[6] From this relatively early period in the transmission of Peter's work outside Paris the spurious attribution to the bishop of Lincoln was recapitulated throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, especially in the British Isles, disseminated in particular from the priory of St. Cuthbert in Durham, where MS L11 formed part of the collection in the fourteenth century (see also below, MSS C2, D3, and D4). Altogether, Durham was a centre for the transmission of Peter's work, whether attributed to Grosseteste or not: eight extant manuscripts of Peter's work can be associated with the priory there in the Middle Ages.[7] In the fifteenth century, the same spurious attribution is found in manuscripts in central Europe, where Grosseteste is often referred to as 'Linconiensis' (see below, MSS B1, F1,

Literature, 31 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 18–19; Carla Casagrande and Silvana Vecchio, *I peccati della lingua: disciplina ed etica della parola nella cultura medievale*, Bibliotheca Biographica Sezione Storico-Antropologica (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1987), pp. 141–74. For evidence of John of Wales as the author of this text, see Siegfried Wenzel, 'The Continuing Life of William Peraldus's *Summa vitiorum*', in *Ad litteram: Authoritative Texts and their Medieval Readers*, ed. by Mark D. Jordan and Kent Emery, Jr, Notre Dame Conferences in Medieval Studies, 3 (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992), pp. 135–63 (pp. 142–43).

[6] The sigla are taken from the list of manuscript witnesses of the complete transmission of the text that I have compiled. In the list below, I have given the folios on which Peter's text survives and indications of the manuscript's provenance.

[7] Besides MSS D1, D2, D3, D4, and L11 mentioned in the list below, copies of the *Tractatus moralis de oculo* completed in Britain with an unclear authorial attribution or none at all are also extant in the following manuscripts associated with Durham: Durham, Durham University Library, MS Cosin V.I.13, fols 148^{v}–155^{v} (s. xiv ex), which formed part of the collection of the Episcopal library in Durham (MS D6), and MS D5, fols 1^{r}–94^{v}, mentioned above in n. 2.

Kw1, M4, M5, and W3). The early interest in the text in Britain, even transmitted anonymously, resulted in an important and unique witness to the desire for abbreviated copies of Peter's work,[8] but by the mid-fourteenth century, complete and professionally prepared copies of the *Tractatus* were being made available in Britain.[9] Where the name of the bishop of Lincoln was added to manuscripts of the *Tractatus*, this was often done by later hands in what one can suspect was an attempt to overcome the burden of anonymity (see below, MSS C2, C5, D1, L1, L4, L9, O7, O10, and O11).[10] Still, at least some English book owners or librarians felt reservations about ascribing the work to Grosseteste: the evidence of Oxford, Magdalen College, MS lat. 6 (MS O10) indicates that by the fifteenth century there was some uncertainty about including the text in Grosseteste's oeuvre (the table of contents of the manuscript notes that some people ascribe the work to the Bishop of Lincoln, but others to John of Wales), and a later title added to Oxford, Merton College, MS 216 (MS O15) reports that the work is only 'said' to be by Grosseteste. One can also observe that copies of the *Tractatus* continued to be produced in Britain throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries without the need for any authorial attribution.[11] Nevertheless, the attractiveness for post-medieval owners of ascribing the treatise to a well-known and historically important author with a documented interest in optics may be indicated in Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 451 (MS Da1), where in spite of a contemporary fifteenth-century attribution of the text to Peter of Limoges, a modern hand (perhaps from England) has inscribed Grosseteste as the author at the end of the treatise. In all, an attribution of the *Tractatus moralis de oculo* to Robert Grosseteste is found in the following extant manuscripts:

[8] Tallinn, Tallinna Linnaarhiiv, MS f. 230, n. 1, s. Cm 3, fols 257^{r}–272^{v} (s. xiv^{1}) (MS Tn), discussed below, p. 188.

[9] Worcester, Worcester Cathedral Library, MS Q.14, fols 115^{r}–183^{r} (s. xiv) (MS Wr2); Worcester, Worcester Cathedral Library, MS Q.72, fols 125ra–160va (s. xiv med) (MS Wr3).

[10] Attributing the text to an author from 'Lymochia' can be seen in the same light, as noted already in MS D5 (see above, in n. 2), and MS O3, fols 28^{rb}–59^{vb} (s. xv in) and MS O4, fols 302ra–340va (anno 1444/5 or after), both mentioned above in n. 3.

[11] These can be found in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 122 (*SC* 1985), fols 6^{r}–54^{v} (s. xiv in) (MS O2); Wisbech, Town Library, MS 7, fols 41^{r}–76^{r} (s. xiv ex) (MS Ws); Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Barlow 29 (*SC* 6426), fols 42ra–48^{vb} (s. xv^{1}) (MS O18); and, if it is of British provenance, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 3605, pp. 1–213 (s. xv) (MS P13).

B1: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preußischer Kulturbesitz, MS lat. fol. 439, fols 228ra–256va [tabula on fols 257^{r}–260^{r}] (anno 1450) attributed to 'dominus linconiensis' [*sic*].[12]

By: Bryn Mawr, Bryn Mawr College Library, MS 18, fols 44ra–102^{rb} (s. xiii/xiv) attributed to 'Lincolniensis' (in a different hand than the scribe's) — written in England; the manuscript belonged to William Wynham in the mid-fourteenth century, was in the possession of the dukes of Newcastle until 1937/8, and was donated to Bryn Mawr College in 1995 by Phyllis Goodhart Gordan (*olim* Goodhart MS 66).[13]

C2: Cambridge, Jesus College, MS Q.G.19 (67), fols 170^{r}–225^{v} (s. xiv^{2}) attributed to 'Lincolniensis' (in a later hand) — the manuscript was in the library of the Benedictine cathedral priory of St. Cuthbert in Durham (it was MS G and is mentioned twice in the 1395 list of books preserved in the cloister).[14]

C5: Cambridge, St John's College, MS D.16 (91), fols II.1^{r}–24^{v} [tabula of chapter and section headings on fol. 25$^{ra–vb}$] (s. xiv^{1}) attributed to 'Dominus [in the colophon: 'venerabilis'] Robertus Lincolniensis' (in a later hand), *olim* Cambridge, Peterhouse, MS 279, pt II (the manuscript is mentioned in the Peterhouse catalogue of chained and *electio* books from 1418 with later additions [as MS 163; Peter's text is item 2]); it was donated to St John's College by William Beale, master of the college, 1633–44.[15]

[12] Isabella Schiller-Dienstbier, 'Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des Heiligen Augustinus in Ostdeutschland nebst Edition einer bisher unbekannten Predigt des Kirchenvaters' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Universität Wien, 2009), p. 80; Rainer Kurz, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des Heiligen Augustinus*, Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 8 vols (Wien: Böhlau, 1969–79), v. 1 (1975), 102; with information supplied by Dr Peter Jörg Becker.

[13] Description available at *Bryn Mawr College Library Special Collections: Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts* <http://www.brynmawr.edu/library/speccoll/guides/ms18.shtml> [accessed 12 May 2011].

[14] Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, p. 62; Montague Rhodes James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Jesus College, Cambridge* (London: Clay, 1895), pp. 103–04; *Catalogi veteres librorum ecclesiae cathedralis Dunelm[ensis]*, [ed. by J. Raine], Publications of the Surtees Society, 7 (London: Nichols, 1838), pp. 77, 79.

[15] Peter D. Clarke, *The University and College Libraries of Cambridge*, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues, 10 (London: British Library in association with the British Academy, 2002), pp. 485–86; Montague Rhodes James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the*

Da1: Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 451, fols 44ra–61^{vb} (s. xv med) attributed to 'magister Petrus de Sapiera Lemovicensis dyocesis' (and in a modern hand at the end of the text to 'Robertus Lincolniensis') — in s. xvii it was in the Benedictine English College, where it belonged to William Hyde who gave it to the Bibliothèque municipale in 1646.[16]

Db: Dublin, Trinity College Library, MS 115 (A.5.3), pp. 301–61 [alphabetical tabula for letters A–V on pp. 362–65] (*c.* anno 1375–77) attributed to 'lincolniensis' in the colophon of the text and in the list of contents of the manuscript added in the late fourteenth century — from England; the scribe was Adam de Stocton, *lector* in the Convent of Austin friars in Cambridge.[17]

D1: Durham, Durham Cathedral Library, MS A.IV.18, fols 1^{r}–62^{v} (s. xv^{1}) attributed by Thomas Rud in the early eighteenth century to Robert Grosseteste — most folios are severely damaged and trimmed at the top; the text begins now near the end of the Prologue with the words 'oculi respectu ceterarum' and ends shortly after the beginning of Chapter 14 with the words 'ad te fugit territa turba' (with the loss of folios after this point).[18]

D2: Durham, Durham Cathedral Library, MS B.III.18, fols 292ra–319ra (s. xv^{1}) attributed to 'Lincolniensis' in a medieval hand in the table of contents of the volume on fol. i^{v}, in the scribal hand in the colophon of the text on fol. 319^{r}, and in a modern hand on fol. 292^{r}; it is probably based on MS D3 — the manuscript is among the books connected with Richard

Manuscripts in the Library of St John's College Cambridge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1913), pp. 121–22.

[16] Robert Grosseteste, *De decem mandatis*, ed. by Richard C. Dales and Edward B. King, Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi, 10 (Oxford: British Academy by Oxford University Press, 1987), p. xi; *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des départements*, 7 vols (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1849–1885), VI (1878), 261–63.

[17] Marvin L. Colker, *Trinity College Library Dublin: Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts*, 2 vols (Aldershot: Scolar, 1991), I, 238–44; Marvin L. Colker, *Trinity College Library Dublin: Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts, Supplement One* (Dublin: Four Courts, 2008), pp. 180–81; Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, p. 24; Thomas K. Abbott, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin* (Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, 1900), p. 14.

[18] Thomas Rud, *Codicum manuscriptorum Ecclesiae Cathedralis Dunelmensis catalogus classicus* (Durham: Humble, 1825), p. 70.

Bell, monk of Durham *c.* 1426–79; it was in the library of the Benedictine cathedral priory of St Cuthbert in Durham by the later fifteenth century.[19]

D3: Durham, Durham Cathedral Library, MS B.III.19, fols 203va–239va [the index to the four texts in the manuscript, found on fols 253va–258ra, attributes all of them to 'Lincolniensis'] (s. xiv ex) attributed to 'Lincolniensis' by a later hand in the table of contents of the volume on fol. i^{v} — written in England (e.g., an English gloss 'help mary' on fol. 237^{r} [near the beginning of Chapter 14 of Peter's text] is probably in the scribal hand); the manuscript was in the library of the Benedictine cathedral priory of St Cuthbert in Durham by the mid-fifteenth century.[20]

D4: Durham, Durham Cathedral Library, MS B.IV.29, fols 128ra–163^{vb} (s. xiv^{1}) attributed to 'Lincolniensis' in a medieval hand at the bottom of fol. 163^{v}, in the hand of Thomas Swalwell (d. 1539) in the table of contents of the volume on fol. i^{v}, and in Thomas Rud's hand at the top of fol. 128^{r} — the manuscript was in the library of the Benedictine cathedral priory of St. Cuthbert in Durham by the mid-fifteenth century; the last few words of the treatise ('qui sine fine uiuit et regnat. Amen.') were added in a modern hand on fol. 163^{vb} from MS D3.[21]

F1: Frankfurt, Stadt- u. Universitätsbibliothek, MS Praed. 16, fols 397ra–434ra [alphabetical tabula on fols 434^{r}–437^{r}] (*c.* anno 1460) attributed to 'dominus Linconiensis' — written in Germany; it was MS 820 in the Dominican library in Frankfurt (and still belonged to the Dominicans at the beginning of the sixteenth century).[22]

Kw1: Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, MS 1214, pp. 233–278 (s. xv^{2}), attributed to 'Linconiensis' — from Cracow; apparently owned by Arnulph of Mirzinec (d. *c.* 1490); perhaps an example of the abbreviated version mentioned below, pp. 186–87.[23]

[19] Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, p. 67; Rud, *Codicum manuscriptorum*, pp. 161–63; with information kindly supplied by Mr Alan J. Piper.

[20] Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, p. 67; Rud, *Codicum manuscriptorum*, p. 163.

[21] Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, p. 68; Rud, *Codicum manuscriptorum*, pp. 233–34; with information kindly supplied by Mr Alan J. Piper.

[22] Gerhardt Powitz, *Die Handschriften des Dominikanerklosters und des Leonhardstiftes in Frankfurt/Main*, Kataloge der Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek Frankfurt/Main, 2. 1 (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1968), pp. 30–36.

[23] M. Kowalczyk and others, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum medii aevi Latinorum qui in Bibliotheca Jagellonica Cracoviae asservantur, vol. VII: Numeros continens inde a 1191 usque ad*

L1: London, British Library, MS Additional 16167, fols 84ra–107va [tabula on fol. 83$^{va–vb}$] (s. xv) attributed in a modern hand to 'Robertus Grossetete, Licolniensis [!] episcopus'.[24]

L3: London, British Library, MS Arundel 200, fols 15^{r}–43^{v} [alphabetical tabula of topics on fols 43^{v}–48^{v}] (s. xv^{1}) attributed to 'Robertus Grosteste Lincolniensis episcopus' in the colophon — the outer leaves have been lost from the first quire so that the text is now missing from the Prologue to Chapter 6, v (the copy begins in Chapter 6, v [Inc., fol. 1^{r}: 'ab aliquibus non videri prodit in publicum']) and from Chapter 7, iii to Chapter 7, x (the last words in Chapter 7, iii, fol. 18^{v}, being: 'Per comes cogitationes eo quod sint'; and the first words in Chapter 7, x, fol. 19^{r}, being: 'conferre potuit salutis incrementa'); it was donated by Henry Howard, of Norfolk, to the Royal Society.[25]

L4: London, British Library, MS Cotton Otho D. x, fols 2^{r}–21^{v} (s. xiv med) attributed by a later hand to 'Robert [...]' — it was severely damaged by fire in 1731.[26]

L5: London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius C. xiv, fols 7ra–30^{rb} (s. xiv ex/xv in) attributed to 'Lyncolniensis' in the colophon — it, too, was damaged by fire.[27]

1270 (Kraków: Księgarnia akademicka, 2000), pp. 108–13. Arnulphus de Mirzyniec achieved a BA at the university in Cracow in 1451 and was later elected rector of the university. I would like to thank A. Sobańska in the Department of Manuscripts for checking this manuscript.

[24] J. A. Herbert, *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 3 vols (London: British Museum, 1910; repr. Bath, 1962), III, 413; Charles Trice Martin, 'Preface', in *Registrum epistolarum fratris Johannis Peckham, archiepiscopi cantuariensis [...] Published by the Authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the Direction of the Master of the Rolls*, ed. by Charles Trice Martin, Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores, or Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages, 77, 3 vols (London: Longman, 1882–85), III, p. xcvi; *Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum in the Years MDCCCXLVI–MDCCCXLVII* (London: British Museum, 1864), p. 157; description available through the 'Search our Catalogue Archives and Manuscripts' page at the British Library web site [accessed 25 July 2013].

[25] Ron B. Thomson, 'Jordanus de Nemore: Opera', *Mediaeval Studies*, 38 (1976), 97–144 (p. 114); Martin, 'Preface', in *Registrum epistolarum*, III, p. xcvi; *Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the British Museum, New Series 1.1: The Arundel Manuscripts* (London: British Museum, 1834), p. 53; description available through the 'Search our Catalogue Archives and Manuscripts' page at the British Library web site [accessed 25 July 2013].

[26] Elizabeth C. Teviotdale, 'Some Classified Catalogues of the Cottonian Library', *British Library Journal*, 18. 1 (1992), 74–87.

[27] Walter Röll, 'Der "Convertimini"-Traktat als Quelle der "Gesta Romanorum"', in *Fest-*

L6: London, British Library, MS Royal 6 E.v, fols 211^{rb}–227^{rb} (s. xiv^{2}) attributed to 'Lincolniensis' in the opening rubric — the manuscript was in the library of the Augustinian priory in Merton (Surrey).[28]

L9: London, British Library, MS Royal 12 E.xxi, fols 105^{r}–145^{r} (s. xv^{1}) attributed to 'Lincolniensis alias Grostheed' in a later hand — some sections of the chapters are missing (e.g., Chapters 6, vi; 6, viii; 6, ix; 6, xi; 6, xiii; 7, vii; etc.) and the rest is highly abbreviated; the manuscript belonged to Archbishop Cranmer and John, lord Lumley.[29]

L11: London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 483, fols 4^{r}–70^{v} [tabulae on fols 1^{r}–3^{r} (chapter and section headings) and 70va–74va (alphabetical register of topics)] (s. xiv in) attributed to 'dominus Robertus grostest episcopus Lyncolniensis' — the manuscript was in the library of the Benedictine cathedral priory of St Cuthbert in Durham.[30]

M4: München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 17477, fols 217ra–256^{vb} [tabula on fols 211^{r}–216^{v}] (anno 1490) attributed to 'Rudbertus Lin-

schrift Walter Haug und Burghart Wachinger, ed. by J. Janota and others, 2 vols (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1992), I, 485–504 (p. 487); Grosseteste, *De decem mandatis*, ed. by Dales and King, p. xv; Martin, 'Preface', in *Registrum epistolarum*, III, p. xcvii; Herbert, *Catalogue of Romances*, III, 136–43; *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Cottonian Library, Deposited in the British Museum* (London: Hansard, 1802), p. 427; description available through the 'Search our Catalogue Archives and Manuscripts' page at the British Library web site [accessed 25 July 2013].

[28] Stuart Jenks, 'Astrometeorology in the Middle Ages', *Isis*, 74 (1983), 185–210; Servus Gieben, 'Robert Grosseteste at the Papal Curia, Lyons 1250', *Collectanea Franciscana*, 41 (1971), 340–93 (p. 345); Siegfried Wenzel, 'Robert Grosseteste's Treatise on Confession "Deus est"', *Franciscan Studies*, 30 (1970), 218–93 (pp. 226–27); Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, p. 130; George F. Warner and Julius P. Gilson, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collections*, 4 vols (London: The Trustees, 1921), I, 155–57; Martin, 'Preface', in *Registrum epistolarum*, III, p. xcvi; description available through the 'Search our Catalogue Archives and Manuscripts' page at the British Library web site [accessed 25 July 2013].

[29] Warner and Gilson, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts*, II, 57–58; Herbert, *Catalogue of Romances*, III, 155–66; Martin, 'Preface', in *Registrum epistolarum*, III, p. xcvi; description available through the 'Search our Catalogue Archives and Manuscripts' page at the British Library web site [accessed 25 July 2013].

[30] Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, p. 74; Montague Rhodes James and Claude Jenkins, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Lambeth Palace: The Mediaeval Manuscripts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932), pp. 667–68; Henry John Todd, *A Catalogue of the Archiepiscopal Manuscripts in the Library at Lambeth Palace* (London: Law and Gilbert, 1812), p. 61.

coniensis' — the manuscript belonged to the Benedictine monastery at Scheyern.[31]

M5: München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 18412, fols 85ra–128^{rb} [alphabetical tabula on fols 77^{v}–84^{r}] (s. xv) attributed to 'Rudbertus Linconiensis' and 'Johannes Pythsanus' — the manuscript belonged to the Benedictine monastery at Tegernsee.[32]

O7: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 527 (*SC* 814), fols 220^{r}–256^{r} [alphabetical tabula of topics on fol. 256$^{va–vb}$, fragment (folios missing)] (s. xiv^{1}) attributed to 'lyncolniensis' by a later hand — from England, perhaps copied in Yorkshire (on fol. 256^{r}, immediately following Peter's text but not in the scribe's hand, one finds: 'In dei nomine amen. Ego iohannes de garton eboracensis dyocesis Anno domini millesimo CCC. lix condidi testamentum meum in hunc modum'), the manuscript may originally have belonged to Cistercians.[33]

O10: Oxford, Magdalen College, MS lat. 6, fols 3^{r}–59^{v} [tabula on fol. 2$^{r–v}$] (s. xiv in) attributed to 'lincolniensis' (also found as 'Grostete' [*sic*] in the manuscript) and 'Wallensis' in the fifteenth-century table of contents in the manuscript (where the text is described as follows: 'Tractatus bonus de oculo morali, quem quidam dicunt esse Lincolniensis, alii doctoris Wallensis') and in fifteenth-century hands at the end of the text — from England (?), belonged to John Martyll (b. *c.* 1381, fellow of Oriel College, Oxford).[34]

[31] Karl Halm and others, *Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis*, vol. 2/3: *Codices Num. 15121-21313 complectens*, Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis, 4/3 (München: Bibliothecae Regiae, 1878; repr. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1969), p. 101.

[32] Halm and others, *Catalogus codicum latinorum*, II. 3, 161–62.

[33] H. O. Coxe, *Bodleian Library Quarto Catalogues, II: Laudian Manuscripts*, rev. edn by R. W. Hunt (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1973), pp. 568–69, cols 381–85; F. Madan and H. H. E. Craster, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, 7 vols in 9 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895–1953), II. 1 (1922), 35; Martin, 'Preface', in *Registrum epistolarum*, III, pp. xciv–xcv; J.-Th. Welter, *La Tabula exemplorum secundum ordinem alphabeti: recueil d'exempla compilé en France à la fin du XIII^{e} siècle* (Paris: Occitania, 1926), p. 131; with information supplied by Dr B. C. Barker-Benfield.

[34] H. O. Coxe, *Catalogus codicum MSS. qui in Collegiis Aulisque Oxoniensibus hodie adservantur*, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1852), II, 9–10; with information supplied by Dr B. C. Barker-Benfield.

O11: Oxford, Magdalen College, MS lat. 27, fols 111^{r}–142^{v} (s. xiv) attributed to 'lyncolniensis' in a fifteenth-century hand in the title — from England.[35]

O12: Oxford, Magdalen College, MS lat. 202, fols 183va–216va [alphabetical tabula on fols 216va–220^{rb}] (s. xv^{1}) attributed to 'venerabilis dominus Lincolniensis' in the colophon — from England.[36]

O14: Oxford, Merton College, MS 82 (B.1.8), fols 64ra–95^{rb} (s. xv in) attributed to 'Lincolniensis' in a later hand (on the flyleaf in the table of contents of the manuscript) — from England, partially written in Oxford by Thomas Lovecock, fellow of Balliol College from 1417 until at least *c*. 1422; acquired by Merton College in the fifteenth century.[37]

O15: Oxford, Merton College, MS 216 (N.1.10), fols 203ra–229ra (s. xiv^{1}) attributed to 'Robertus Lyncolniensis vt dicitur' (in a later title) — the manuscript was given to William Rede [Reed], provost of Wingham, by Nicholas of Sandwich, and by Reed to the college in 1374; it also belonged to Walter Robert; the manuscript may have been intended for Dominican use (it contains works by Simon Boraston, prior provincial of the Dominicans in England, 1327–36).[38]

O16: Oxford, Oriel College, MS 20, fols 272^{r}–310^{v} (s. xv in) attributed to 'Lincolniensis' in the colophon — from England, the manuscript was donated to Oriel College by Robert Grafton, fellow of the college in the mid-fifteenth century.[39]

[35] Martin, 'Preface', in *Registrum epistolarum*, III, pp. xcv–xcvi; Coxe, *Catalogus Codicum*, II, 18–19; with information supplied by Dr B. C. Barker-Benfield.

[36] Martin, 'Preface', in *Registrum epistolarum*, III, p. xcvi; Coxe, *Catalogus Codicum*, II, 91–92; with information supplied by Dr B. C. Barker-Benfield.

[37] R. M. Thomson, with N. G. Wilson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts of Merton College, Oxford* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2009), p. 78; Gieben, 'Robert Grosseteste at the Papal Curia, Lyons 1250', p. 346; Martin, 'Preface', in *Registrum epistolarum*, III, p. xcv; F. M. Powicke, *The Medieval Books of Merton College* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1931), p. 230; Coxe, *Catalogus Codicum*, I, 45.

[38] Thomson and Wilson, *A Descriptive Catalogue*, p. 155; Powicke, *The Medieval Books of Merton College*, pp. 172–73; Martin, 'Preface', in *Registrum epistolarum*, III, p. xcv; Coxe, *Catalogus codicum*, I, 83.

[39] Martin, 'Preface', in *Registrum epistolarum*, III, p. xcvi (who calls this 'MS 200'); Coxe, *Catalogus codicum*, I, 7; with information supplied by Dr B. C. Barker-Benfield.

W3: Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS 4343, fols 34^{r}–55^{v} (*c*. anno 1433) attributed to 'linconiensis' — this is a fragment (the copy ends in Chapter 8, vii), it belonged to the Hofbibliothek in Vienna by the early seventeenth century.[40]

In addition, the name of the bishop of Lincoln was associated with the *Tractatus* in a number of attested copies of the text. All of these codices are attested from libraries in Britain:

1. Cambridge, Peterhouse, MS 78, item 1, attributed to Grosseteste — the manuscript is mentioned in the catalogue of chained and *electio* books from 1418 with later additions.[41]
2. Cambridge, St Catharine's College, MS 3, attributed to Grosseteste — the manuscript is mentioned in the list of benefactors and their books, 1504–22, donated by the founder of the college, Robert Wodelarke.[42]
3. Durham, Cathedral Priory of St Cuthbert, MS K, attributed to Grosseteste — the manuscript is mentioned in the 1395 list of books preserved in the cloister and again in the list of books preserved in the case for novices (under 'Libri Lincolniensis').[43]
4. Durham, Cathedral Priory of St Cuthbert, MS M, attributed to Grosseteste — the manuscript is mentioned in the 1395 list of books preserved in the cloister and again in the list of books preserved in the case for novices (under 'Libri Lincolniensis').[44]
5. Durham, Cathedral Priory of St Cuthbert, MS 9, attributed to Grosseteste — the manuscript is mentioned in the 1395 list of books pre-

[40] Guido Hendrix, *Hugo de Sancto Caro's Traktaat 'De doctrina cordis'*, Documenta Libraria, 16, 4 vols (Leuven: Bibliotheek van de Faculteit Godgeleerdheid, 1995), I, 99, 108; Franz Unterkircher, *Die datierten Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek von 1401 bis 1450*, Katalog der datierten Handschriften in lateinischer Schrift in Österreich, 2. 1 (Wien: Böhlau, 1971), p. 90; *Tabulae codicum manu scriptorum [...] in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobonensi asservatorum*, 10 vols (Wien: Geroldi, 1864–99; repr. Graz: Akademische Druck und Verlagsanstalt, 1965), III, 246; with information supplied by Dr Eva Irblich. Description available at *Mittelalterliche Handschriften in österreichischen Bibliotheken* <http://manuscripta.at/_scripts/php/manuscripts.php> [accessed 15 May 2011].

[41] Clarke, *The University and College Libraries of Cambridge*, p. 465.

[42] Clarke, *The University and College Libraries of Cambridge*, p. 593.

[43] *Catalogi veteres*, [ed. by Raine], pp. 79, 83.

[44] *Catalogi veteres*, [ed. by Raine], p. 82.

served in the cloister and again in the list of books preserved in the case for novices (under 'Libri Lincolniensis').[45]

6. Ipswich, Franciscan Convent, MS (unnumbered), attributed to Grosseteste — the manuscript is mentioned as item 1 in the list of donors of books from the fourteenth century.[46]
7. Isleworth, Syon Monastery, MS K 45 (655), item 8, attributed to 'Lyncolniensis' — the manuscript was donated to the monastery by John Bracebridge, priest at Syon; it is mentioned in the *registrum* of the library of the Brethren from *c*. 1500–*c*. 1524.[47]
8. Isleworth, Syon Monastery, MS N 19 (873), item 1, attributed to 'Lyncolniensis' — the manuscript was donated to the monastery by John Bracebridge, priest at Syon; it is mentioned in the *registrum* of the library of the Brethren from *c*. 1500–*c*. 1524.[48]
9. Leicester, Abbey of the B.V.M. de Pratis, MS 584, item 3, attributed to Grosseteste — the manuscript is mentioned in the catalogue of books in the abbey from *c*. 1477–94.[49]
10. London, Austin Friars, MS 1, attributed to Grosseteste — the manuscript was described *c*. 1545 by John Leland.[50]

In their quotations from the *Tractatus*, English readers often repeated the spurious attribution of the work to Grosseteste. When, for example, the fifteenth-century author of a recently edited vernacular sermon for the Third Sunday

[45] *Catalogi veteres*, [ed. by Raine], p. 83.

[46] Richard Sharpe, *British Medieval Library Catalogues: List of Identifications* (updated 10 September 2008), p. 570; available at <http://www.history.ox.ac.uk/sharpe/list.pdf> [accessed 25 July 2013].

[47] *Syon Abbey*, ed. by Vincent Gillespie, with *The Libraries of the Carthusians*, ed. by A. I. Doyle, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues, 9 (London: British Library, in association with the British Academy, 2001), p. 192; *Catalogue of the Library of Syon Monastery, Isleworth*, ed. by Mary Bateson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1898), p. 86.

[48] *Syon Abbey*, ed. by Gillespie, pp. 271–72; *Catalogue of the Library of Syon Monastery*, ed. by Bateson, pp. 121–22.

[49] T. Webber and A. G. Watson, *The Libraries of the Augustinian Canons*, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues, 6 (London: British Library, in association with the British Academy, 1998), pp. 227–28.

[50] K. W. Humphreys, *The Friars' Libraries*, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues, 1 (London: British Library, in association with the British Academy, 1990), p. 7.

in Lent, arguably the Benedictine Hugh Legat, wanted to warn his listeners to practise what they preach, he quoted an *exemplum* about a fool who confounded the theologians of the university in Paris by asking them a simple question: whether it is better for someone to put into practice what he knows or to continue to learn what he does not know:

> Thes philosophi, musing gretlych of þys questyoun, arguit pro and contra to heiþer party. Thys fol stode style, alwey heryng after solucioun of thys questioun. So at þe laste yt was diffinit and determit amonge hem that hyt was beter and more meritorie to do that man kowde and knewe than to lere that he knode naw3t. 'Qwerefore semyt me', quod thys fole, '3e be more lewdyr and vnkonyng than I, in that 3e besy so gretlyche abow3t þat 3e can now3t, nat fulfyllyng in dede that 3e haue y-leryt and can'.

Thus, says the preacher, this narrative from 'Lincolne, *De oculo morali*' shows that some may preach devout sermons, but they remain 'wonder lewde and repreuabyl'.[51] The entire passage has nothing to do with Grosseteste, of course; it is taken, in partially close translation, from Peter's *Tractatus*.[52] Elsewhere in England the Benedictine Robert Rypon (d. after 1419) quotes the treatise in two sermons, as do a number of other preachers of the fifteenth century whose texts are preserved in both Latin and English.[53] As an *exempla* collection, the

[51] 'A Sermon for the Third Sunday in Lent from Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud misc. 706', 62–76, ed. by Alan Fletcher, in *Late Medieval Popular Preaching in Britain and Ireland. Texts, Studies, and Interpretations*, Sermo, 5 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), pp. 86–87. See also Patrick J. Horner, 'An Edition of Five Medieval Sermons from MS Laud misc. 706' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Albany, 1975), pp. 111–46.

[52] See the entire *exemplum* in the earliest printed edition of Peter's text: *Johannis Pithsani archiepiscopi Canthuariensis ordinis fratrum minorum liber de oculo morali foeliciter incipit* (Augsburg: Sorg, 1475 [?]), Chapter 6, xi, unpaginated [hereafter Pr1]: 'Pulcre semel confutauit Parisius quorundam theologorum multitudinem quidam stultus. Multis enim theologis in quibusdam scolis Parisius congregatis ingrediens quidam stultus: "Quero", inquit, "a vobis omnibus, quid horum est melius: facere, quod homo scit, vel addiscere, quod nescit"? Tunc illis super iam mota questione disputantibus et pro et contra arguentibus stultus eorum audiens altercacionem tacuit, expectans vt videret finem. Tandem conclusum est et probatum, quod melius est facere, quod homo iam nouit, quam addiscere, quod non nouit, quia sicut dicit Apostolus, ad Romanos ii: Non auditores legis tantum sed factores iustificabuntur. Et Ysidorus De summo bono dicit: Lector strenuus potius ad implendum, que legat, quam ad sciendum erit promptissimus. Minus enim peccatum est nescire, quod appetas, quam ea, que noueris, non implere. "Ergo", inquit stultus, "omnes estis dementes, qui tantum die ac nocte laboratis, vt addiscatis, quod nescitis, et non curatis opere adimplere, quod scitis"'.

[53] Siegfried Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections from Later Medieval England: Orthodox*

Tractatus moralis de oculo became an important part of the pastoral work of the late-medieval church in Britain.

The author of the *Tractatus* is that Peter of Limoges, who was born in the first half of the thirteenth century in Donzenac in the diocese of Limoges and who died on 2 November 1306.[54] He was a member of the Sorbonne who was involved with both the arts and the theology faculties, achieved both the baccalaureate and the *magister* in theology,[55] served as a canon of Évreux, was a copyist of sermons, and was also widely known as an astronomer.[56] His treatise on the eye, a medieval best seller, was written while he was at the Sorbonne, between 1275/6 and 1289,[57] and was transmitted extensively. In spite of there being many anonymous copies of the work, the evidence points to Peter of Limoges as its author. First, though none of the *pecia* copies (including the important one in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 16395 (MS P7)) contains an authorial attribution, Peter's name appears in other early copies of the text (and those centred around Paris) more often than that of any other person.[58] Some of the best copies of the text also come from Peter's own library. As will be seen, one of these latter manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 16396 (MS P8), is another important copy that has corrections to the text and marginal comments in what may be Peter's own

Preaching in the Age of Wyclif, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature, 53 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 328.

[54] Barthélemy Hauréau, 'Sermonnaires', in *Histoire littéraire de la France*, 41 vols in 42 (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1733–1981), xxvi (1873), pp. 460–63; see also Hieronymus Spettmann, 'Das Schriftchen "De oculo morali" und sein Verfasser', *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 16 (1923), 317–22.

[55] Nicole Bériou, 'La Prédication au béguinage de Paris pendant l'année liturgique, 1272–1273', *Recherches augustiniennes*, 13 (1978), 105–229 (p. 108 and n. 13).

[56] Léopold Delisle, *Le Cabinet des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque impériale*, Histoire Générale de Paris, 6, 3 vols in 4 (Paris: Imprimerie impériale, 1868–81), ii (1874), 168. For Peter's activity as an astronomer see Lynn Thorndike, 'Peter of Limoges on the Comet of 1299', *Isis*, 36 (1945–46), 3–6. Peter's university dossier is found in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 16390, fols 9^{r}–14^{v}.

[57] Richard Newhauser, 'Der "Tractatus moralis de oculo" des Petrus von Limoges und seine *exempla*', in *Exempel und Exempelsammlungen*, ed. by Walter Haug and Burghart Wachinger, Fortuna vitrea, 2 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1991), pp. 95–136 (pp. 99–100).

[58] See Spettmann, 'Das Schriftchen "De oculo morali" und sein Verfasser', pp. 318–19, and see the observation on this point, first mentioned by Spettmann, in A. Teetaert, 'Jean Pecham', in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, ed. by A. Vacant and others, 15 vols (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1903–50), xii. 1 (1933), pp. 100–40 (pp. 114–15).

hand. Furthermore, entries in Peter's handwriting in the more than seventy books still extant from his personal library emphasize a number of passages in the texts he commented on that are directly used in the treatise on the eye.[59] But the last, and most telling, bit of evidence is provided by Peter's extant university papers in which he not only explicitly refers to the treatise four times, but also gives a summary of some of his sources for Chapter 11.[60]

The work was originally intended for university members and prelates in Paris; they are addressed — and chastised — frequently in the treatise. Chapter 11 is devoted entirely to the presuppositions necessary for *scolares* to lead a moral life. Chapter 12 is devoted to the vision of prelates. But even beyond this, all parts of the work are filled to overflowing with citations from carefully named authorities who would have been impressive in the school system as evidence of one's advanced learning. From Latin patristics all major ethical

[59] See Peter's additions to his copy of Bacon's *Perspectiva* in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 7434, fols 13^{r}–48^{v}, a selection from which can be found in Madeleine Mabille, 'Pierre de Limoges et ses méthodes de travail', in *Hommages André Boutemy*, ed. by G. Cambier, Collection Latomus, 145 (Brussels: Revue d'études Latines, 1976), pp. 244–51 (p. 247). The text in this manuscript was identified by Alexandre Birkenmajer as Bacon's *Perspectiva* in 'Pierre de Limoges commentateur de Richard de Fournival', *Isis*, 40 (1949), 22.

[60] Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 16390, fol. 13va: 'Ad hoc autem, quod scolaris ad hanc scienciam perfeccionem attingat, tria principaliter requiruntur, videlicet humilitas in intellectu, puritas in affectu, studiositas in effectu. Primo, dico, requiritur humilitas in intellectu, vnde Salomon, Proverbiorum xi: Vbi humilitas, ibi sapiencia, et Mathei xi de sapiencia increata: Confiteor tibi pater etcetera, et asina Balaam etcetera, et Bernardus de scala Iacob, et Ysidorus Libro soliloquiorum et Ptolomeus in Almagesti: Qui inter sapientes humilior etcetera. Hec omnia require *libro de oculo*, xi capitulo de scolaribus, primo capitulello. Hec autem scolaris humilitas secundum Hugonem Didascalicon libro tercio tria continet documenta, videlicet ut a nemine discere erubescat; ut nullam scienciam uel scripturam uilem habeat; ut, cum scienciam adeptus fuerit, ceteros non contempnat. Propter primum ait Augustinus: Ego senex et tot annorum episcopus etcetera, et Paulus ab Anania et Gamaliele ibi. Hec omnia require vbi supra, scilicet *libro de oculo*, xi capitulo de scolaribus, primo capitulello [...]. Secundo requiritur in uiro scolastico puritas in affectu. Sapiencia enim, cum sit speciosior sole, ut dicitur Sapiencie 7, mundum requirit hospicium et immundum habitaculum detestatur, sicut enim candela madefacta etcetera, et oculus lippus etcetera. Hec omnia require in dicto *libro de oculo*, predicto capitulo xi, primo capitulello [...]. Tercio requiritur studiositas in effectu — Bernardus ad fratres de Monte Dei: De cotidiana lectione, et Seneca: Cum multa percurreris, et idem: Qui scripta sua torquerent. Sed multi sunt scolares desides etcetera, Seneca: Desidioso studere etcetera. De talibus poeta: Sunt quidam, qui scire uolunt etcetera. Hec omnia require dicto *libro de oculo*, xi capitulo, capitulello v^{o}'. (My emphasis.) The text has been printed in Louis-Jacques Bataillon, 'Sermoni e orazioni d'ambiente universitario parigino nel sec. XIII', *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale*, 5 (1994), 297–329 (pp. 307–11). See Bériou, 'La Prédication au béguinage de Paris pendant l'année liturgique, 1272–1273', p. 108, n. 13.

texts are mentioned from Ambrose to the *Vitae Patrum*; Athens is represented by Aristotle and Plato; medieval historiography by, among others, Helinand of Froidmont; medicine by Urso Salernitanus, and so on. Peter's list of named authorities is very extensive, but it represents at times the final (not the immediate) sources he used. Such names as Roger Bacon are not mentioned in the treatise, though as I demonstrated some years ago Bacon's *Perspectiva* supplied Peter with the foundation of his method of coordinating the science of optics and theology.[61] Through Peter's work, the development of Perspectivist optics that is so prominent in Bacon's text was made fit for the pulpit. Peter's borrowings are clear not only from what he quotes from Bacon's treatise but also from his glosses in his own manuscript of Bacon's work, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 7434. This manuscript was copied for him by the same scribe whose hand we find in MS P8, a codex that forms part of the bequest of the author's library. Peter's technique of supplying his readers with what must be described as an overabundance of authoritative quotations in conjunction with the subject matter of moralized natural science resulted in a highly successful work. It was first disseminated through the *pecia* system recently developed at the university in Paris and elsewhere, and it is included in the 1304 taxation list of books available at the de Sens family's *stationarius* shop where, as Louis-Jacques Bataillon demonstrated, Peter of Limoges was a very well-established customer.[62] Very soon after its original publication it was transmitted not only in university circles but also in monastic, fraternal, and secular-ecclesiastical environments (initially, and with the greatest frequency, among

[61] Richard Newhauser, '*Inter scientiam et populum*: Roger Bacon, Peter of Limoges, and the "Tractatus moralis de oculo"', in *Nach der Verurteilung von 1277: Philosophie und Theologie an der Universität von Paris im letzten Viertel des 13. Jahrhunderts. Studien und Texte / After the Condemnations of 1277: Philosophy and Theology at the University of Paris in the Last Quarter of the Thirteenth Century. Studies and Texts*, ed. by Jan A. Aertsen, Kent Emery, Jr, and Andreas Speer, Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 28 (Berlin: Gruyter, 2001), pp. 682–703.

[62] The 1304 taxation list is found in the *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, ed. by Heinrich Denifle and Emile Chatelain, 4 vols (Paris: Delalain, 1889–97). Peter's work is mentioned in the later list by Andreas de Sens in II. 1 (1891), 109 (= no. 642). On the work of the de Sens family see Hugues V. Shooner, 'La Production du livre par la pecia', in *La Production du livre universitaire au moyen âge: exemplar et pecia*, ed. by Louis J. Bataillon and others, Actes du symposium tenu au Collegio San Bonaventura de Grottaferrata en mai, 1983 (Paris: Éditions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1988), pp. 17–37 (pp. 23–24), and in the same volume Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse, 'The Book Trade at the University of Paris, ca. 1250–ca. 1350', pp. 41–114 (pp. 56–64; with further bibliography on the *pecia* system). In the same collection see also Louis Jacques Bataillon, 'Comptes de Pierre de Limoges pour la copie de livres', pp. 265–73.

the Cistercians), and it was copied in almost every European region. The work is still extant in 219 manuscripts, with evidence of at least forty-four further copies that have been lost or were destroyed. Peter's treatise was printed three times at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries, four times in the middle of the seventeenth century, and is available in an Italian translation by Theofilo Romano printed in 1496.[63]

With all of Peter's attention to the findings of contemporary optics, one is still justified in maintaining that the treatise on the eye was used primarily as a preaching aid because of two facts that touch on the overall transmission of the work as well as on its treatment in individual copies. First, a functional reception analysis reveals that medieval audiences understood the text as belonging to the system of preaching aids and that it was perceived generically as typical of the genre of the *exempla* collection.[64] In nearly one-third of all extant manuscripts Peter's text has been transmitted with other works that are clear representatives of this genre, such as Caesarius of Heisterbach's *Dialogus miraculorum*, Gregory the Great's *Dialogi*, Robert Holcot's *Convertimini* (if it is by Holcot), Jacobus de Cessoli's *Libellus super ludo schachorum*, and a large number of alphabetically ordered, anonymous collections of *exempla*.[65] Even in those cases in which Peter's text has been preserved with *exempla* collections in miscellany manuscripts, one is generally dealing with codices that were assembled at the latest in the fifteenth century.[66] They, too, are witnesses to the effort

[63] The first complete English translation of the text is now available: *The Moral Treatise on the Eye*, trans. by Richard Newhauser, Medieval Sources in Translation, 51 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2012).

[64] On questions of method in functional reception analysis, consult Georg Steer, 'Gebrauchsfunktionale Text- und Überlieferungsanalyse', in *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Prosaforschung. Beiträge der Würzburger Forschergruppe zur Methode und Auswertung*, ed. by Kurt Ruh, Texte und Textgeschichte, 19 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1985), pp. 5–36.

[65] It should be noted that the 1304 taxation list mentions the *Tractatus* among a list of other preaching aids. See also Louis-Jacques Bataillon, 'Les Problèmes de l'édition des sermons et des ouvrages pour prédicateurs au XIII^e^ siècle', in *The Editing of Theological and Philosophical Texts from the Middle Ages. Acts of the Conference Arranged by the Department of Classical Languages, University of Stockholm, 29–31 August 1984*, ed. by Monika Asztalos, Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis: Studia Latina Stockholmiensia, 30 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1986), pp. 105–20 (pp. 115–16).

[66] See, for example, the excerpts from Peter's treatise and their surroundings in Assisi, Convento dei Frati Minori, MS Com. 442 (first half of the fourteenth century). Compare also Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. lat. 1042, and London, British Library, MS Royal 12 E.xxi (first half of the fifteenth century).

to align Peter's text with its generic peers. If one, then, also includes copies of the *Tractatus* that have been preserved in manuscripts with sermon collections (even leaving aside the few codices that contain the treatise and copies of isolated sermons), one can take account of nearly two-thirds of all the copies of the *Tractatus*. On the other hand, it is striking that the text has been preserved in only four manuscripts that demonstrate an exclusive interest in works of natural science or natural philosophy.[67] Second, the scribal treatment of Peter's work in individual manuscript copies reveals that medieval scribes expended a great deal of effort in drawing attention to those portions of the text that would have been of greatest service for developing and embellishing a sermon, marking clearly the *divisiones* of the topics of the chapters, composing sometimes very elaborate topical indices, and noting the presence of the text's many *exempla* in the margin of the manuscripts. The notations of the illustrative material in the text by scribes and readers alike are not simply a matter of the common transmission of the work; they show the way in which the treatise was actually used. No one *exemplum* is identified as such in the margins of all copies of the text, and no two textual witnesses treat the work's illustrative material in a completely identical manner. Some manuscripts, such as MS O7; Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek, MS 277 (of *c*. 1309) (MS E); and Soest, Stadtarchiv und Wissenschaftliche Stadtbibliothek, MS 18 (of the late fourteenth century) (MS So), contain in the margins up to ninety or more notations of the *exempla* in Peter's text. The *exempla* show how the emphasis in Peter's work lies on the meaningfulness of the nature of vision as it moves from a merely physical phenomenon to a moral and spiritual one. Seeing correctly — that is to say, using the principles of Perspectivist optics to interpret visual perception — is equated here with moral edification.[68]

[67] In the following I have given the folios on which the copies of the *Tractatus moralis de oculo* can be found. 1) Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preußischer Kulturbesitz (*olim* Deutsche Staatsbibliothek), MS Hamilton 630, fols 136ra–186va (alphabetical index 186va–188^{rb}) (fourteenth century). The manuscript is from northern Italy and belonged at one time to the Jesuits in Torino. 2) Frankfurt am Main, Stadt- u. Universitätsbibliothek, MS Praed. 44, fols 293^{r}–310^{r} (*c*. 1440). The copy is incomplete; the scribe broke off his work in Chapter 7. The manuscript is from Germany and was in the library of the Dominican cloister in Frankfurt (where it was MS 1071) before the eighteenth century. 3) Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, MS Plut. XXX cod. 24, fols 29ra–66^{vb} (fifteenth century). The manuscript was copied by a certain Johannes. It is part of the original collection of the library and contains many texts on the subject of astronomy. 4) London, British Library, MS Royal 6 E.v, fols 211^{rb}–227^{rb} (second half of the fourteenth century), attributed to 'Lincolniensis' (MS L6). The manuscript contains many texts on natural science which are all attributed here to Robert Grosseteste.

[68] For recent studies of the implications of Peter's view of moral vision, consult Herbert

The textual transmission of Peter's work demonstrates that these ends of educating vision were thought to be achieved best by having the full text to consult. One is struck, in other words, by the relative lack of redactions of the work: most copies of the treatise I have seen are attempts to reproduce the entire text, though they may no longer be complete in their current state of preservation. There is, however, one important abbreviation in the transmission history of Peter's work that deserves further mention. This redaction is preserved in at least nine codices, all of them apparently from southern Germany or Austria, where they were eagerly circulated early in the history of Peter's text in a monastic environment. The earliest manuscript in this group, however, Sigmaringen, Fürstlich Hohenzollern'sche Bibliothek, MS 12 (MS Sg), which is also the earliest dated copy of the *Tractatus moralis de oculo*, shows some connection to Paris, where the copy was finished in 1303 according to the colophon. Other manuscripts from the fourteenth century that are witnesses to this redaction are monastic productions: Kremsmünster, Benediktinerstift, MS CC 336 (from the beginning of the fourteenth century) (MS K3); and Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preußischer Kulturbesitz, MS Theol. lat. oct. 120a, which was in Cistercian use (second quarter of the fourteenth century) (MS B5). But copies of this line of transmission also moved out of the monastery. Some circulated among the canons regular: Klosterneuburg, Augustiner-Chorherren-Stift, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 1100 (dated 1393) (MS Ks); and Vorau, Augustiner-Chorherren-Stift, MS 390 (early fourteenth century) (MS Vr2). Still other copies demonstrate that there was an interest in this abbreviated version among the secular clergy and fraternal orders: Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS 1571 (fourteenth century) (MS W2), was owned by a 'plebanus de oberndorf' in the late Middle Ages; and Wien, Bibliothek des Theresianums, MS 2° 26 (anno 1436) (MS W5), is a Dominican production, written by 'frater Fridericus de Tullna' in Krems, who was a 'cappellanus' for the Dominican nuns in Imbach (near Krems).[69] Thus, there is a fairly circum-

L. Kessler, '*Speculum*', *Speculum*, 86 (2011), 1–41; Richard Newhauser, 'Peter of Limoges, Optics, and the Science of the Senses', in *Pleasure and Danger in Perception: The Five Senses in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. by Corine Schleif and Richard Newhauser (=*The Senses & Society*, 5. 1 (2010)), pp. 28–44; Dallas G. Denery, II, *Seeing and Being Seen in the Later Medieval World: Optics, Theology, and Religious Life*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, 4th ser., 63 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 75–115.

[69] Also in this line of transmission: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Lat. th. e. 15; and Praha, Národní knihovna ČR, MS XIV.E.25 (2559). Two other copies may belong here, as well: Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, MS 1214 (second half of the fifteenth century); and Kraków,

scribed geographical reach of this line of transmission, once it left France, and an initial monastic concentration of the copies, followed by a widening of the sphere of its influence.

What makes this redaction distinctive textually is the fact that it is only about half as long as most of the other copies of the *Tractatus moralis de oculo*. Because the transmission of this redaction began during Peter's lifetime, one must ask whether it is not evidence of a sanctioned abbreviation. Such a possibility, however, can easily be denied because of a very telling scribal variant in the transmission of the redaction seen in all of its copies. Chapter 6 of Peter's work has the rubric 'On thirteen extraordinary phenomena that contain moral lessons on eyesight' in all copies of the Prologue of the work, where a list is given of the chapter headings.[70] The rubric of the chapter itself varies somewhat from what is given in the Prologue, but it also states explicitly that thirteen extraordinary phenomena will be analyzed in the chapter. This is also how the rubrics for Chapter 6 are treated in the Prologue and text of the abbreviated version, and yet Section ix of Chapter 6 is missing from all copies of this redaction. This section is, to be sure, merely a very brief paragraph, but it has noticeably been skipped over by the scribes of the redaction, and they either change the numbering of all the following sections by giving Section x the number ix, Section xi the number x, and so on, thus arriving at a total of twelve sections for Chapter 6, or they skip the number nine and follow on sequentially from Section x, which yields a broken numerical ordering: vii, viii, x, xi, and so on. Nor is this the only material missing from the abbreviation: the end of the last section of Chapter 6 has been dropped from this redaction, as have also large sequences of material from the ends of Sections vii, x, and xii in Chapter 7; Sections i, v, and vi in Chapter 8; and so on. What is missing here amounts to the full range of *exempla* that Peter included in his text to make it useful for preachers. This abbreviated redaction, then, reveals itself to be a kind of *Reader's Digest* version of the treatise on the eye: everything that one might want to read in Peter's work as the bare bones of what would help prepare a sermon, but not all of the extensive citations that would have made it more time-consuming to have duplicated, and more expensive to have acquired, a copy of the complete text.

Biblioteka Jagiellońska, MS 1245 (second half of the fourteenth century). I have not been able to examine these two codices yet.

[70] Prol [Pr1]: 'Sextum de tredecim mirabilibus circa oculi uisionem moralem continentibus informacionem'.

It is testimony to the early perception of how useful Peter's work could be that the southern German and Austrian redaction is not the only abbreviation of the work that was completed within or shortly after Peter's lifetime. An independent abbreviation, written partially in an Anglicana hand early in the fourteenth century, was brought to the Baltic region presumably by Dominicans. It probably formed part of the library of the Dominicans in Tallinn and is today still in the City Archives there. Though it is not complete, breaking off in Section i of Chapter 11, it too demonstrates that preachers wanted to make use of the moral and scientific material Peter of Limoges had made available for the pulpit shortly after it had been published even if they did not want to take the time or the expense to acquire a complete copy of the work.[71]

The transmission of Peter's work by *pecia* verifies how much of the text is missing in the later abbreviations. This method of transmission also accounts for the relatively high number of early manuscripts of the complete *Tractatus* produced in the environment of the university in Paris, and in fact of the relatively large number of complete thirteenth-century copies still extant altogether. The system aimed to provide students and other readers with accurate copies of texts they would need at a much faster rate than had been possible before. It allowed the stationers (*stationarii* in the narrow sense of this term), or university-affiliated book procurers, to acquire an exemplar of a text, divide it into numbered pieces, or *peciae*, of equal length and offer these pieces for rent to scribes at a predetermined fee so that many copies of the work could be produced simultaneously, this entire process falling under the supervision of the university apparatus. The presence of *pecia* marks in three codices (Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, MS Plut. XXXI sin. 8 (fourteenth century) [MS Fz2]; Linz, Oberösterreichische Landesbibliothek [formerly Bundesstaatliche Studienbibliothek], MS 314 (*olim* 90) (fourteenth century) [MS Lz]; and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 16395 (*c.* anno 1285–95) [MS P7]), ensures that these manuscripts are, at least theoretically, witnesses to the state of the complete text in its earliest transmission in Paris in the form in which Peter delivered it to the de Sens family's *stationarius* shop for publication. Furthermore, indications of *pecia* copying are found in one other witness (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 15942 (*c.* anno 1275–89) (MS P6)), such as a change in the ductus of the scribal hand where *pecia* breaks come in other manuscripts, indicating that this manuscript, too,

[71] This is MS Tn; see above at n. 8. See also Richard Newhauser, Tiina Kala, and Meelis Friedenthal, 'The Work of an English Scribe in a Manuscript in Estonia', *Scriptorium*, 62 (2008), 139–48 and pl. 19.

is a product of the *pecia* system. Finally, two manuscripts of Peter's work that come from his own library have an obvious claim to be included in the corpus used to establish the text: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 16396 (*c*. anno 1300) (MS P8), and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 16435 (thirteenth century) (MS P9). These six manuscripts, then, have a theoretically founded or historical claim to be included in the corpus to establish a 'semi-critical' edition, that is to say, not one that represents all significant variants from all 219 witnesses to the work's transmission, but one that can legitimately be taken to represent the form of the text as it was conceived and first published by its author.

Of course, a theoretical foundation that assures us of a manuscript's place in the more or less direct line of descent from the archetype does not also guarantee in practical terms a perfect text. *Pecia* copies clearly descend from a text that is close to the author's original, but it cannot be claimed that the *pecia* system provides more security for the value of a witness than must ultimately be demonstrated by the quality of its text. Although the presence of *pecia* indications in a codex certifies that its scribe worked within a sanctioned system, only a comparative analysis of the copy can tell how worthwhile it actually is. MS Fz2, for example, completed in the fourteenth century, probably in Paris, is only a second-rate witness to the actual language of Peter's work. The scribe of MS Fz2 committed many eye skips, passing over several lines of text at a time, including what must have been an entire side of a folio of his copy-text in the midst of his work on Chapter 8. When he looked up from the text, he was writing about Pride; when he looked back down, he was in the middle of the section on Envy. He seems never to have noticed the difference:

> [MS Fz2, fol. 187B^{rb}] [Pride:] In hoc similes vespertilionibus que ideo debiliter vident quia humor cristallinus, qui est oculo necessarius ad videndum, transit [other copies continue at this point: in substanciam alarum [...] [424 words, equivalent to two columns of text in this copy, are missing. The text continues without pause in the section on Envy:] Hinc est quod illi, qui sunt [fol. 187B^{va}] illustrioris meriti, magis subiacent invidie et detractioni.
>
> ([Pride:] In this they are similar to bats which see poorly because the crystalline fluid that is necessary for the eye to see is transferred [other copies continue: into the substance of the wings [...]. The text continues in the section on Envy:] For that reason, people who are of more distinguished worth are more subject to envy and slander.)

The scribe also on some occasions wrote two variants into his text when he could not resolve the abbreviation of a word, sometimes going back to cross out the wrong expansion and sometimes simply leaving both possibilities in his

text. The sloppiness of this scribe is not completely his fault; his copy belongs in a group with MS P6, the earliest datable copy of Peter's work that was also produced through the *pecia* system. Together, they offer a series of variants and misreadings that by comparison with the other witnesses in the corpus help to shed light on the best text of Peter's work. Some examples will make this clear:

> Chapter 2: [P7P8P9Lz] Sed hodie propter duriciam [diuicias P6, diuiciam Fz2] prelatorum sepe contingit contrarium. (But today because of the hard-heartedness [P6Fz2: wealth] of prelates, the opposite often happens.)

The hardness or softness of the coverings of the eye, and their metaphorical qualities, are at issue in this chapter, not the corruption of money. How the variant in P6Fz2 occurred can be easily understood because Peter complains throughout the *Tractatus* about the deleterious effect of money on the clergy. Furthermore, in abbreviated form, *duriciam* and *diuiciam*/*diuicias* can be closely similar, leading to a reading of the former as the latter.

> Chapter 7, prol.: [P7P8P9Lz] Est enim oculus numero geminus, compari suo simillimus, colore diuersus, figura spericus, palpebra uelatus, in capite collocatus, specierum uisibilium [diuisibilium P6Fz2] receptiuus
>
> (Now, the eye is doubled in number; each one being exactly like its companion; varied in colour; spherical in shape; covered by an eyelid; located in the head; receptive to visible [P6Fz2: divisible] *species*)

As becomes clear in the discussion in Chapter 7, vii, the form of an object that is perceived in vision, the visible *species* in the technical sense, are at issue here, not the possibility of dividing or separating the *species*. Perhaps the proximity of the word *diuersus* encouraged the addition of the prefix to *uisibilium* to make of it *diuisibilium*. The other *pecia* copies are the work of scribes who took more care to verify the readings of their text and while they show a range of eye skips and other scribal mistakes, they are not as consistently wrong as a group as is P6Fz2.

In particular, MS P7 can be taken as a more accurate, and early, witness to the wording and *ordinatio* of Peter's text in its *pecia* transmission, even before it was formally registered in the 1304 taxation list. According to that list, Peter's treatise was available for rent in twenty *peciae*. MS Lz is clearly a product of that transmission: it does not contain *pecia* notations for all the pieces, but it does have marks for *peciae* viii, x, xi, xiii, xvi, and xviii. But MS P7 has only half the number of *pecia* marks one would expect from the 1304 list: it shows nine notations for *peciae* in the margins for the entire length of the text, numbered ii through x. What makes the difference in the numbers of *peciae* is the fact that the pieces of MS P7 are each four bifolia in length instead of the more normal

two bifolia.[72] The number of *peciae* in a work sometimes varied when a stationer realized that a work was in sufficient demand to justify increasing the number of *peciae* to be offered for rent, so that a variation in the number of *peciae* is not necessarily an indication of a separate edition. If MS P7, then, represents the *pecia* transmission of the *Tractatus* at an early stage, before the number of *peciae* in which the work was made available was doubled, it also demonstrates that in this early transmission the *ordinatio* of the work called for headings for the sections of all the longer chapters. Most of the witnesses have titles for the sections of the long chapters earlier in the treatise (Chapter 6 has thirteen sections; Chapter 7 has twelve; Chapter 8, seven). That Peter's work was designed in its early *pecia* transmission to circulate with section headings as part of the text of the long chapters also found later in the treatise (Chapter 11 through 14) is indicated by the presence of section headings for these chapters in both MS P7 and MS Lz, which do not derive from each other. The section headings were not a standardized feature in all copies of the text: the other witnesses in the corpus omit all section headings after Chapter 8. But their presence in MSS P7 and Lz indicates that in at least one line of transmission of the text section headings were treated uniformly in all the long chapters.

MS P7, too, is not without scribal mistakes, as a few examples will make clear:

> Chapter 8, i: [P8P9LzP6Fz2]: Per cecum natum ille congrue designatur qui de sua origine uel bonis naturalibus inaniter glorians excecatur [exhortatur P7].
>
> (The man blind from birth appropriately designates someone who glories vainly in his lineage or his gifts of nature, and is blinded [P7: admonished].)

Spiritual blindness is at the centre of this examination of pride. One can understand the variant by the scribe of P7 as inspired by the intent of the passage, which goes on to suggest that the proud person should contemplate the vileness of the beginning and end of human life as a way to cure the sin of pride, but the reading in P7 also demonstrates that the scribe was anticipating this admonition.

> Chapter 12, iii: [P8P9LzP6Fz2]: Uidere poterit quod *non deficiat de domo sua fluxum seminis sustinens, et leprosus, tenens fusum, et cadens gladio, et indigens pane* [pene P7], ii Regum iii.
>
> (He will be able to see that 'his house is not without someone suffering a discharge of semen, and one who is leprous, one holding a spindle, and one felled by the sword, and one lacking bread [P7: punishment]', II Samuel 3.)

[72] See Bataillon, 'Les Problèmes de l'édition des sermons', pp. 115–16.

All six witnesses subsequently concur that it is a lack of bread ('panis indigentiam') that is to serve as the basis for moral interpretation, as is suggested in the passage from the Vulgate. Thus, those lacking bread are taken to designate the avaricious among the people close to a prelate. Here, again, the scribe of P7 has anticipated a conclusion drawn from this passage, namely that prelates should exercise discipline in their own households by punishing those who are sinful. But variants of these kinds are fairly limited in an otherwise relatively good copy that must be consulted to establish a critical text of the *Tractatus*.

The copies of the treatise in Peter's own library form a special group. MS P9 is a rough version of the text, perhaps a working draft of the treatise before Peter completed it fully to his satisfaction. It has numerous gaps in the text and idiosyncratic formulations, but it also agrees enough with the rest of the *pecia* copies to make it useful as a witness for a critical edition. MS P8, on the other hand, is a careful copy that contains Peter's text in the hand of a scribe he used to reproduce other material. Because it is later than the other Parisian members of the corpus, it may have been conceived as a fair copy for a new *pecia* exemplar or a presentation copy, but it remained in Peter's library because the scribe made a mistake near the beginning of the text that caused him to cancel about a third of a page. Furthermore, a few of the early folios of the manuscript (mainly fols 5^{r}–6^{v}) contain some corrections of the text first written by the scribe. These corrections, entered by the scribe himself, may indicate that he was working initially on the early chapters of Peter's treatise from an uncorrected copy-text, but then went back to revise his work using a corrected copy. In any case, the scribe's corrections here represent the best line of transmission of the *Tractatus* that is also found in the *pecia* copies. Most important, in the margins of the codex one also finds comments, apparently by the author and in what might be his own hand. Finally, P8 is also the only codex of some eighty I have examined at greater length that provides a valid reading for a passage which amounts to an error in the archetype. At the end of Chapter 6, which is devoted to optical illusions, Peter refers to what is called the 'moon illusion', by which heavenly bodies appear to be larger when they are closer to the horizon than when they are seen at a higher angle of incidence. The manuscripts representing the *pecia* transmission read at this point (with minor variants): 'Et sicut reputamus mirabile quod stella cum ascenderit ad celi medium maior appareat, cum iam ad intuentis oculum non magis accedat, sic eciam [...]' (And just as we count it extraordinary that when a star ascends to the middle of the sky it appears larger, although at the same time it is not drawing closer to the eye of the observer, in just the same way [...]). Many later witnesses of the text have the word *maior* here, thus making it seem as if a heavenly body would appear larger the higher

it climbs in the sky, but in a number of the later manuscripts this is also simply changed to *minor*. The word *maior* also contradicts the scientific description of the moon illusion that Peter had just given at the beginning of Chapter 6, xiii, though it anticipates the moral lesson in humility that is to be drawn from this optical phenomenon, namely that it is extraordinary when people in high position turn out to be small, that is humble. Some scribes who paid attention to the scientific error undertook changes in the text to make it more scientifically accurate, as apparently the scribe of the copy-text represented in Pr1 did (which reads: 'Et sicut reputamus mirabile quod stella cum ascenderit ad celi medium minor appareat, cum tamen ad intuentis oculum magis ascendat, sic eciam [...]' (And just as we consider it extraordinary that when a star ascends to the middle of the sky it appears smaller, although to the eye of the observer it is ascending higher, in just the same way [...])). The scribe of MS P9 noticed the problem, as well, and attempted a simple fix, but in some ways he made the problem worse:

> [MS P9] Et sicut reputamus mirabile quod stella cum ascenderit ad celi medium maior non appareat, cum iam ad intuentis oculum magis accedat, sic etiam [...]
>
> (And just as we count it extraordinary that when a star ascends to the middle of the sky it does not appear larger, although at the same time it is drawing closer to the eye of the observer, in just the same way [...])

In MS P8, the reading of the *pecia* transmission is also altered, so that *maior* has been corrected to *minor*, *ad intuentis oculum* to *ab intuentis oculo*, and *accedat* to *recedat*, to yield the following: 'Et sicut reputamus mirabile quod stella cum ascenderit ad celi medium minor appareat, cum iam ab intuentis oculo non magis recedat, sic eciam [...]' (And just as we count it extraordinary that when a star ascends to the middle of the sky it appears smaller, although at the same time it is not moving any further from the eye of the observer, in just the same way [...]).[73] It might have been Peter himself who corrected MS P8, though clearly not before the erroneous reading had begun to circulate in *pecia* copies of his treatise and through much of the transmission of the text in the centuries to follow. Thus, we are left with a situation in which copies of the text close to the archetype and the copy which shows signs putting it in direct contact with

[73] The completed sentence in P8 reads in more fluid translation: 'We count it extraordinary that when a star ascends to the middle of the sky it appears smaller, although at the time it is not moving any further from the eye of the observer, and in just the same way we count it extraordinary that the more exalted someone is in honor, the more humble he wants to be seen, since this is a rare occurrence.'

the author do not agree with each other. The reading of MS P8 is unique, but since all other signs point to the special nature of this manuscript as a witness of the text, if we assume that this is Peter's last, and belatedly corrected, word on the subject, the reading might be accepted in the edition.

The relationship between the witnesses used in the corpus of manuscripts for a critical edition still needs to be made more precise, but the value of MS P7 and MS P8 in establishing that text stands out clearly. Just as clearly, one can see the relative value of multiple *pecia* copies for the establishment of a text transmitted through the *pecia* system. Though they give a theoretical advantage to the editor in that they guarantee a view of the text close to the origins of its promulgation, that view may be obscured by the actual abilities of the scribe copying the text from a *pecia* exemplar or another *pecia* copy. The general lack of attention of the scribe of MS Fz2 to his copy-text should give every editor pause. While *pecia* copies represent theoretically sanctioned texts, and may in fact be prepared as carefully as MS P7, they may never be as authoritative as a copy commissioned by the author that became a volume in the author's own library. It is part of the capricious luck of the preservation of medieval codices that MS P8 has survived to make the work of the editor of Peter's text that less arduous. There are many more remarkable factors connected with the *Tractatus moralis de oculo*, from a mistake in the archetype to the general anonymity of much of its transmission, but as an important influence on medieval *pastoralia* in the British Isles the work and its author — not Robert Grosseteste but Peter of Limoges — deserve to be better known today.